



**ABATEMENT APPEALS BOARD**

**NOTICE OF MEETING**

**Wednesday, November 14, 2025 at 9:30 a.m.**

**Remote Hearing via video and teleconferencing**

Watch SF Cable Channel 78/Watch [www.sfgovtv.org](http://www.sfgovtv.org)

Watch: <https://bit.ly/4hDuRPh>

**PUBLIC COMMENT CALL-IN: 1-415-655-0001 / Access Code: 2660 346 3740**

**ADOPTED DECEMBER 17, 2025**

**MINUTES**

**A. CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL.**

The meeting of the Abatement Appeals Board for Wednesday, October 15, 2025 was called to order at 9:40 a.m. and roll was taken by Commission Secretary Harris, and a quorum was certified.

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:**

**Vice President Bianca Neumann**  
**Commissioner Alysabeth Alexander-Tut**  
**Commissioner Dan Calamuci**  
**Commissioner Judy Lee**  
**Commissioner Lindsey Maclise**  
**Commissioner Catherine Meng**  
**Commissioner Kevin Williams**

---

**MEMBERS OF THE BOARD**

Bianca Neumann, Vice President  
Alysabeth Alexander-Tut, Commissioner  
Dan Calamuci, Commissioner  
Judy Lee, Commissioner  
Lindsey Maclise, Commissioner  
Catherine Meng, Commissioner  
Kevin Williams, Commissioner

---

**DEPARTMENT REPRESENTATIVES**

Matthew Greene, Secretary to the Board (628) 652-3510  
Sonya Harris, BIC Secretary (628) 652-3510  
  
Code Enforcement Section (628) 652-3430  
Housing Inspection Services (628) 652-3700

**CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE REPRESENTATIVE**

Jesse Mainardi, Deputy City Attorney (415) 554-4724

---

**Ramaytush Ohlone Land Acknowledgment.**

The Abatement Appeals Board acknowledges that we are on the unceded ancestral homeland of the Ramaytush Ohlone, who are the original inhabitants of the San Francisco Peninsula. As the indigenous stewards of this land and in accordance with their traditions, the Ramaytush Ohlone have never ceded, lost, nor forgotten their responsibilities as the caretakers of this place, as well as for all peoples who reside in their traditional territory. As guests, we recognize that we benefit from living and working on their traditional homeland. We wish to pay our respects by acknowledging the Ancestors, Elders, and Relatives of the Ramaytush Ohlone community and by affirming their sovereign rights as First Peoples.

**B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: *(Discussion and Possible Action)***

**Discussion and possible action to adopt the minutes for meeting held on: October 15, 2025.**

**Public Comment**

Secretary Harris requested that the minutes of October 15, 2025 be continued to the next meeting.

*Commissioner Alexander-Tut made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Meng, to continue the minutes to the next Abatement Appeals Board meeting.*

There was no public comment.

*The motion carried unanimously.*

**C. NEW APPEALS: Orders of Abatement *(Discussion and Action)***

**1. CASE NO. 6961: 2345-2347 Clement Street - Complaint # 202295405**

**Owners of Record & Appellant:** CP CLEMENT LLC

**ACTION REQUESTED BY APPELLANT:** Appellant appeals the September 16, 2025 Order of Abatement and assessment of costs.

**Public Comment**

Chief Building Inspector of Code Enforcement Mauricio Hernandez presented and made the following points:

- The property is an apartment building, and a mixed-use building.
- This case originated from an online web-form complaint received on 10/24/2024 regarding suspected illegal construction at the rear of 2345-2347 Clement Street. Field verification confirmed substantial unpermitted work including demolition and reframing of a three-story rear vestibule, detachment of the connected three-story rear stair, and construction of a

### **Abatement Appeals Board – Minutes – Meeting of November 14, 2025 – Page 3**

detached storage shed on casters. The work exceeded the scope of the active siding permit, and the rear stair structure was minimally braced, resulting in an unsafe condition.

- A first Notice of Violation (NOV) was issued by BID on 10/28/2024, directing the owner to cease all work and obtain appropriate permits. The case was later referred to CES following non-compliance. A Director's Hearing was held on 7/15/2025, where the Hearing Officer granted a 60-day advisement to obtain corrective permits and final inspections under PA 202505096207 and PA 202505096216.
- Although multiple permits have been issued and minimal corrective work has occurred, no final inspections have been obtained. Field verification on 10/30/2025 confirmed that critical portions of the NOV remain uncorrected, including incomplete siding, an unanchored three-story stair (approximately two-foot separation), and the detached storage structure remaining onsite.
- An Order of Abatement (OOA) was issued on 9/16/2025, posted on 9/22/2025, and an Initial Bill was prepared, including eight (8) months of Monthly Monitoring Fees (MMF) from 1/8/25 to 9/16/25. The appellant requested relief and additional time to complete work.
- Staff recommendation is to uphold the Order of Abatement including all Assessment of Costs.
- The violation cited on the Notice of Violation remain uncorrected and required permits remain open without inspection, and minimal inspection history.
- The life safety conditions persist, including an unanchored three-story stair, incomplete siding, and the detached shed remains on site.

Secretary Harris stated that the Appellant is asking to provide the Board with an additional submission, which may require a vote.

Deputy City Attorney Mainardi stated that the Appellant relayed that the handout is a statement of what he would be saying during his appeal, as well as additional photos. Typically, there is a deadline for written submissions, but he is going to read it verbatim. In an abundance of caution, the Board should vote to accept or not accept since it is a written submission.

Commissioner Alexander-Tut said she believed the Board should accept the submission, but wanted to hear from other Commissioners.

Commissioner Williams stated that the more information, the better. Especially, if anything included could be shown on the projector. He also said the department should have a copy.

The Appellant stated that he provided copies for everyone, including the department staff.

***Commissioner Williams made a motion to accept the late submitted additional evidence and statement, which was seconded by Commissioner Calamuci.***

**Abatement Appeals Board – Minutes – Meeting of November 14, 2025 – Page 4**

There was no public comment.

***The motion carried unanimously.***

The Appellant Mr. David Silverman stated that he represented CP CLEMENT LLC.

Mr. Silverman provided the Commissioners and staff with a 2 ½ page document that he read verbatim. (Please see the attached document for Mr. Silverman's statement.)

**Public Comment:**

Mr. Christopher Schroeder said there appear to be 3 outstanding special inspections, and several site visits. Why aren't the special inspections cleared because they are structural.

**Staff Rebuttal:**

Chief Inspector Hernandez stated the following:

- CES could only find one inspection that resulted in a required re-inspection, so for the Appellant to say everything has been inspected is not accurate.
- There were failed inspections, and only one inspection that noted there was a partial rough frame that was approved on the first floor. There was evidence that there was some work covered without inspection.
- An unsafe condition was observed and inspector asked to secure the site for the next inspection. When someone fails an inspection, the owner or contractor should fix the items and then call for re-inspection. This took place in September of this year and after that there have been no other inspections.
- Regarding the trades permit, it had nothing to do with the violation and that is more of an elective type of work that the owner decided to do.
- The NOV and staff report say that the basis of the violation is the structure. In the past couple of days staff received pictures of the structure being removed, so now they are wondering if it was a temporary structure. Staff also received a report from the architect stating that the only work that was supposed to be done was to rebuild the landings.
- It is strange that the structure is being removed, which looked almost brand new because it has pressure treated materials. Staff does not understand what the full scope of work is and there is minimum inspection history, and there is no evidence that the siding is complete.
- The Appellant called out that Inspector McConn went to the site, which he did but that was to take pictures for the AAB hearing.
- CES inspectors do not do inspections related to a permit, they do the enforcement. The district inspector under BID does the inspections and that is what needs to be done.

## **Abatement Appeals Board – Minutes – Meeting of November 14, 2025 – Page 5**

### **Appellant Rebuttal:**

- In the statement, the rough cover inspection was approved.
- Stairs were rebuilt because they were poorly built the first time.
- This was an inheritance property, and there was 50 years worth of no maintenance.
- The owner decided to demo the stairs.
- There was a question regarding the structural calculation, but their engineer already went out to the property.

Members of the Abatement Appeals Board (Alysabeth Alexander-Tut, Dan Calamuci, Judy Lee, Lindsey Maclise, Catherine Meng, and Kavin Williams,) made comments and asked various questions of DBI staff and the Appellant pertaining to the Appeal.

Commissioner Maclise questioned the Appellant about which engineer was used. The designs showed Tom Sable was the engineer, but she stated that he usually did not do that type of work.

### **Secretary Harris Called for a Roll Call Vote:**

<b>Vice President Neumann</b>	<b>Excused</b>
<b>Commissioner Alexander-Tut</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Calamuci</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Lee</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Maclise</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Meng</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Commissioner Williams</b>	<b>Yes</b>

***Commissioner Alexander-Tut made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Meng, to hold the Order of Abatement and Assessment of Costs in abeyance for 60 days.***

### **D. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT.**

Mr. Christopher Schroeder said he noticed on complaints of violations, it says 30 days to file a building permit, obtain a permit within 60 days, and complete all work and correct all violations in 90 days. On complaint #202430152 issued on 10/28/24, none of this has been complied with. Code enforcement was not effectively complied with or the statutes for the corrective action. He alleged that files were placed in Mr. O’Riordan’s office. Mr. Schroeder stated that there should not be preferential treatment and corrective action should be adhered to. Regarding time deadlines, things should not go back to the district inspector and it should be linear. When it is bounced back and forth between the district inspector and code enforcement, it is not effective code enforcement action. There are many buildings in the city that have expired permits or Temporary Certificates of Occupancy (TCOs) that are currently occupied. He mentioned 2207 25<sup>th</sup> Street where Mr. O’Riordan wrote the Notice of Violation. It is occupied and it was written that all that was left was the front façade of the building, but the owner got a permit to remove it and the building is an

**Abatement Appeals Board – Minutes – Meeting of November 14, 2025 – Page 6**

unlawful demolition. Mr. Schroeder alleged that there was discussion of a number of NOV's on the property.

**E. ADJOURNMENT**

*Commissioner Alexander-Tut made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Williams, to adjourn the meeting.*

*The motion carried unanimously.*

The meeting was adjourned at 10:23 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Sonya Harris, BIC Secretary